



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,665	12/13/2005	Angela Basilio	21376YP	2299
210 MERCK P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907	7590 03/16/2010		EXAMINER GOON, SCARLETT Y	
			ART UNIT 1623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/16/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,665	BASILIO ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
SCARLETT GOON	1623	

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) SCARLETT GOON. (3) _____.

(2) Ms. Baerbel R. Brown. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 March 2010

Time: about 1:30 pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1, 2 and 7

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Ms. Brown, Applicants' representative, was contacted to discuss potential allowable subject matter. The Examiner suggested insertion of the word "purified" into claims 1 and 2, and making claim 7 dependent on claim 1, in order to put the case in condition for allowance. Ms. Brown questioned the need to insert the recitation "purified" into the claims as it would narrow the scope of the claims, but indicated that she would discuss the suggested amendments with Applicants. On 11 March 2010, Ms. Brown questioned whether insertion of the recitation "purified" into the claims would raise new matter issues as the recitation is not literally disclosed in the Specification. Upon further discussion with the SPE, it was determined that inclusion of the recitation "isolation," as in the instantly filed claim amendments, is sufficient to overcome the prior art because the prior art does not disclose isolation of the compound as recited in the instant claims, and this information was relayed to Ms. Brown. However, the Examiner maintained that it was necessary to amend claim 7 to depend on claim 1. Ms. Brown agreed to the amendment.

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/SCARLETT GOON/
 Examiner, Art Unit 1623

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)